DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 046 077 EA 003 198

AUTHOR	Shaver, Louis Harold
TITLE	The Texas High School Principal: Characteristics and Views on Selected Educational Issues.
INSTITUTION	East Texas School Study Council, Commerce.
PUB DATE	Jun 70
NOTE	84p.
AVAILABLE FROM	East Texas School Study Council, East Texas State University, Commerce, Texas 75428 ($2.00)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Activism, *Administrator Attitudes, *Administrator Background, *Administrator Characteristics, Administrator Responsibility, Administrator Role, Certification, Collective Negotiation, Educational Planning, Federal State Relationship, *High Schools, Negotiation Agreements, *Principals, Teacher Administrator Relationship, Teacher Evaluation

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to draw a comprehensive, reliable, and current profile of the Texas senior high school principalship. Data were gathered through distribution of a questionnaire to principals in each of five University Interscholastic League school classifications. Included in the questionnaire were sections dealing with personal characteristics, educational preparation, professional experience, duties and compensation, and professional activities. Efforts were made to determine principals' attitudes toward professional negotiations, certification and preparation standards for administrators, evaluation of teachers, educational planning, student activism and unrest, and the role of the Federal Government in education. This report is divided into: (1) general outline of the study; (2) review of the literature related to the secondary school principalship; (3) analysis of responses to the questionnaire items; and (4) findings, conclusions, and recommendations. (Author/LLR)

ED046077

Available

Best Copy

THE TEXAS HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL: CHARACTERISTICS AND VIEWS ON SELECTED EDUCATIONAL ISSUES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

by

LOUIS HAROLD SHAVER, PH.D.

EA 003 198

East Texas School Study Council
East Texas State University
Commerce, Texas

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I. Page

Introduction..... 1

Statement of the Problem..... 3
Significance of the Study..... 3
Procedure for the Collection of Data..... 4
Treatment of the Data..... 5
Delimitation of the Study..... 5
Organization of the Remainder of the Study..... 5

CHAPTER II.

Review of Related Literature..... 7

The Principal and Teacher Evaluation..... 17
The Principal and Student Dissent..... 24
The Principal and Professional Negotiations..... 29
The Principal and Federal Activities..... 35
The Principal and Professional Preparation..... 39

CHAPTER III.

Presentation of the Data..... 46

General Background..... 46
Personal and Professional..... 48
Pressures on the Principal..... 54
Administrative Certification..... 57
Principal's Role in Administration..... 58
Teacher Evaluation..... 60
Educational Leadership..... 63
Professional Negotiations..... 64
Student Activism and Student Unrest..... 66
Federal Activities in Education..... 68

CHAPTER IV.

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations..... 70

Summary..... 70
Conclusions..... 72
Recommendations..... 76

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The high school principalship is one of the key administrative positions in any local school district. By virtue of this key position, the high school principal is one of the most influential persons in determining the educational quality of the school. To a great extent, the major responsibility for the development of a rich educational experience for each student at the building level is vested in the high school principal. According to Jones, et. al., the quality of the principal's contribution to the facilitation of the instructional program is the final justification for his services.[1] Trump and associates agreed that the principal's greatest responsibility is instructional leadership. They felt that the principal's highest priority must be assigned to the improvement of instruction.[2]

Although leadership in instructional improvement is perhaps the most important function of the high school principal, there are numerous other areas in which he exercises functions which are essential

---

[1]James J. Jones, C. Jackson Salisbury, and Ralph L. Spencer, Secondary School Administration (New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1969), p. 296.

[2]J. Lloyd Trump and Associates, "The Principal's Role in Improving Instruction," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LI (May, 1967), 77.

to the well-being of the school. The principal has an important role in the area of personnel--recruitment, selection, evaluation, and in-service development. The principal often serves as an important member of the school district's public relations team. Frequently, he carries the major responsibility for the development of a school-community relations program in his attendance area. The many managerial duties associated with the principalship--student personnel activities, business and finance, and auxillary services--are important adjuncts to the teaching-learning process. Successful accomplishment of these managerial duties is necessary to the success of the educational function of the principalship and the school.

Many factors have combined to challenge the historic role of the principal as manager of the educational program at the building level. Michael felt that the greatest problem has been created by the schism over professional negotiations which seems to be developing among teachers, boards of education, and the chief school administrators.[3] McGowan saw a changing role for the high school principal as did Gibb.[4] Each of these writers indicated that the principal's role is rapidly becoming more that of an educational leader and less that of a mere manager of the school's day-to-day activities.

---

[3]Lloyd S. Michael, "The Principal and Trends in Professional Negotiations," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LII (May, 1968), 10.

[4]William N. McGowan, "Changing Role of the Secondary School Principal," Journal of Secondary Education, XLII (October, 1967), 280-5; Jack R. Gibb, "The Expanding Role of the Administrator," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LI (May, 1967), 46-60.

In order to meet the varied responsibilities which are commonly associated with the high school principalship and to meet the challenge of the new role in which the principal is being placed, it is important to obtain information about the characteristics of the high school principalship and about the Texas principals' views on current educational issues.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The specific purpose of this study was to draw a comprehensive, reliable, and up-to-date profile of the Texas senior high school principalship. Factors considered in the profile included: background and formal preparation for the position, current status, on-the-job activities, characteristics of the school, perceived problems, and views toward the educational issues of today.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Although a similar study had been conducted on the superintendency and the elementary school principalship in the state, no in-depth study had been conducted on the Texas high school principalship. This study, which presents a profile view of the Texas high school principal in the various size schools of the state should provide principals, superintendents, and school board with valuable information about the background of the high school principal and his views on current educational issues.

Professional personnel with aspirations toward the high school principalship should gain helpful information about the characteristics and requirements of the position, the background of present practitioners, and the various professional routes which have led to appointment to this position.

This study should be useful to colleges and universities engaged in preparing personnel for administrative positions in the public schools. The views of practicing administrators on current educational issues should be utilized to strengthen these preparation programs.

PROCEDURE FOR THE COLLECTION OF DATA

A questionnaire was designed to help determine personal characteristics, educational preparation, professional experience, duties and compensation, and professional activities of the principal. A second part of the questionnaire was designed to determine current educational practices and the principal's views toward current issues in education. Issues considered were: professional negotiations, certification and preparation standards for administrators, evaluation of teachers, educational planning, student activism and unrest, and the role of the federal government in education.

After the questionnaire was developed, the tentative instrument was submitted to a panel of judges for their suggestions. This panel consisted of principals from each of the five University Interscholastic League classifications of schools and the Executive Secretary of the Texas Association of Secondary School Principals. Their comments were solicited upon the clarity of questionnaire items, the pertinence of these items to a study of the high school principalship, and general suggestions for the improvement of the survey instrument.

After the questionnaire was revised, incorporating the suggestions of the panel, it was submitted to a random sampling of thirty-five per cent of the high school principals of each of the five University Interscholastic

League classifications of schools. These classifications are based upon the number of high school students: Class B, less than 115 students; Class A, 115-225 students; Class AA, 225 to 450 students; Class AAA, 450 to 1020 students; and Class AAAA, 1020 or more students.

TREATMENT OF THE DATA

Results obtained by the survey were reported for each of the five groups and for the total sample. Each question on the first part of the questionnaire was reported by percentages for each of the five groups and a median was derived for each group and for the total sample. A narrative analysis was prepared for each question.

Data obtained by the second part of the instrument were reported in percentage form for each group of respondents and for the total sample. A narrative analysis was prepared for each item.

DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY

This study was limited to those thirty-five per cent of the senior high school principals from each of the five University Interscholastic League classifications who were selected at random for participation in the study. For the purposes of this study, a senior high school principal was considered to be the principal of any building unit which included a twelfth grade class. The data included in the study were limited to that gathered by the survey instrument.

ORGANIZATION OF THE REMAINDER OF THE STUDY

Chapter II contains a review of the literature related to the field of the secondary school principalship.

Chapter III contains an analysis of responses to the questionnaire items.

Chapter IV contains a summary of the findings, conclusions based upon those findings, and the investigator's own recommendations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The high school principalship represents a specialized type of educational administration and is, perhaps, one of the most important administrative positions in the public school system. No amount of quality of administrative services provided elsewhere in the school system can compensate for a lack of quality at the level of the school principalship. It is at the principal's level that administrative services actually go into action to facilitate the work of the teacher with the children. Optimum results will be obtained only if the person in charge is professionally competent.[5]

Schools of today are what they are due to decisions made in the past. Schools of the future will assume certain forms, provide certain programs, and follow certain procedures as a result of educational decisions which are being made today.[6] Never before has it been so important that those who organize and administer secondary education in the United States have the highest degree of professional competence. The demands of our

---

[5]David B. Austin, Will French, and J. Dan Hull, American High School Administration: Policy and Practice. (3rd Ed.: New York: Holt, Rhinehart, and Winston, 1962), pp. 25-26.

[6]Jones, p. 38.

society on this level of our national enterprise have multiplied at a startling rate and no diminution seems to be in sight.[7]

In discussing the requirements of the administrator's job, Griffiths cited a "three-skill" approach--technical, human, and conceptual. Technical skills include proficiency in handling school finance, pupil accounting, class scheduling, and building maintenance. Human skill is the ability to work effectively with people. Conceptual skill enables the administrator to see the school as a whole and to act in a manner which furthers its total effectiveness. In evaluating the relative worth of these various skills, Griffiths concluded that human and conceptual skills are far more important to successful administration than are technical skills.[8]

Campbell suggested three major activities of the administrator. First, the administrator helps the organization clarify and define its purposes. The second obligation of the administrator is to coordinate the organization. Third, the administrator must obtain the resources which will permit the organization to fulfill its objectives.[9]

Gibb reported five general trends in the dramatically changing role of the high school principal:

1. The administrator is becoming less a controller and disciplinarian and more a team builder and cooperative problem solver. Administrators are learning that they can contribute to the educative

---

[7]Austin, p. 27.

[8]Daniel E. Griffiths, Human Relations in School Administration, (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1956), pp. 8-20.

[9]Roald Campbell, "Application of Administrative Concepts to the Elementary Principalship," National Elementary Principal, XLV (April, 1965), 22.

process by helping to create cooperative team and problem-solving groups.

2. The administrator is becoming less a motivator and persuader than a "gardener" or climate builder. The administrative task is to help create the kind of climate in the school which allows people to grow.

3. The administrator is becoming less a fire-fighter and more a planner. He views education as a system and works with teachers and students in developing goals and procedures.

4. The principal is becoming less a conservator, resistor, and preserver of the culture and more a creator and a quiet revolutionary.

5. The principal is becoming less a role and more a person. He becomes effective only as he becomes more personal, available, present, human, and emotional with other people.[10]

Tomkins stated that the way in which the principal views his role will set the tone for the entire school. If he sees his primary function as a "manager" or as one who "lays down the law," the school will recognize that detail and rulings are of great importance. If he considers his role to be the school's instructional leader, instruction will be considered to be of primary importance by the teachers and by students. If he encourages the faculty to initiate and try out more imaginative ways to make teaching and learning effective, the school will take on the characteristic of being innovative.[11]

The principal's main opportunity to provide leadership is to set an educationally favorable tone for the school. As the leader

---

[10]Jack R. Gibb, "The Expanding Role of the Administrator," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LI (May, 1967), 46-60.

[11]Ellsworth Tomkins, "The Principal's Role in School Development," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XLI (October, 1965), 2.

of the school, he fulfills various roles of leadership--status leader, peer, discussion leader, and sometimes follower. In each role, he must make sure that staff members are free to question and to offer alternative suggestions. Otherwise, they may spend time trying to figure out how the principal wants them to behave rather than working to improve instruction.[12]

The principal must be able to inspire confidence. He has the responsibility to do all in his power to give each of his teachers a sense of security and to protect them against any unwarranted criticism. Only by showing loyalty to his staff members, can he expect to command their loyalty.[13]

One of the first requirements of the principal is that he must be able to work with people. Corbally, et. al., cited "balance" as the primary personality trait which enables the principal to accomplish this task. They also considered the traits of originality and flexibility to be important since the principal must often deal with such diverse personalities as the district superintendent, the head custodian, or the irate parent. Ambition, the desire to do a job well, and initiative to put this ambition to work are also very important. Other traits, desirable if not carried to an extreme, are: a sense of humor, an even disposition, self-confidence, and a certain degree of gregariousness.[14]

---

[12]Tomkins, 2-3.

[13]Bryon W. Hansford, Guidebook for School Principals (New York: The Ronald Press, 1961), pp. 6-7.

[14]John E. Corbally, T. J. Jenson, and W. Frederick Staub, Educational Administration: The Secondary School (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1961), pp. 285-286.

Douglas named five developments which he feels may contribute to the evolution of a new type of administration for the modern secondary school. These are: (1) the increased size and complexity of the school; (2) the expansion of the scope of the program of secondary education; (3) the change in the nature of the high school student body; (4) the increased amount of professional information and techniques of school administration; and (5) the changed attitude of people toward specialization.[15]

McGowan predicted that in the years ahead no educational position will change more than that of the secondary principalship. He identified as factors serving as stimuli for change: (1) general improvement in the preparation and training of certificated personnel; (2) automation of business procedures and the development of better management systems; (3) public interest focusing upon education since "Sputnik"; (4) new irterest in the economic value of education; (5) greater teacher interest in educational planning and policy formation; and (6) new developments in curriculum and educational techniques. As a result of these change stimuli, McGowan predicted the following role changes in the position of the high school Principal:

1. Most of the "technician functions of the principal will be taken over by machines and non-certificated personnel. The principal will no longer be "running" the school but he will be one of a group of people representing staff personnel who will be sharing this responsibility. His status will depend upon his ability to provide professional leadership rather than from an inheritance accorded by his assignment to a position.

---

[15]Harl R. Douglas, Modern Administration of Secondary Schools (Boston: Ginn and Co., 1963), p. 20.

2. The principal of the future will be the nominal head of the professional staff. His first responsibility will be to help the staff establish and maintain a sense of direction in the constant evolution of a professional program and then to facilitate constant, coherent, and free-flowing communication.

3. The role of the principal is shifting from that of a manager to that of a professional leader. Within the next decade, he may well return to the role of "principal teacher."[16]

Spears believed that the principal's main concern should be that of establishing and maintaining educational programs suitable for young minds. He considered curricular planning and development as a cooperative enterprise in which teachers, learners, parents, supervisory personnel, and the public all have parts to play. In all activities related to educational improvement, the principal's duty is to serve as a coordinator. His role is to stimulate, to encourage, to facilitate, and to know when it is time for him to step aside and get out of the way of progress.[17]

McGrew felt that if the thesis is accepted that the number one priority of the school is instruction, then it is necessary to conclude that instructional leadership and instructional responsibility are implicit in the position of the principal. He suggested that if the principal is to meet these responsibilities, first, he must be convinced that his primary job is instructional leadership and that he is in a unique position to deliver that leadership; then, he must carefully examine his surroundings to determine what resources are at his disposal

---

[16]William N. McGowan, "Changing Role of the Secondary School Principal," Journal of Secondary Education, XLII, (October, 1967), 280-285.

[17]Mack J. Spears, "A Principal's Influence," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LI (November, 1967), 45-53.

for the improvement of instruction.[18]

Congreve maintained that school improvement depends on the intense involvement of everyone within the enterprise working in a unique but cooperative way toward self-improvement and working collectively toward composite improvement. He felt that such a procedure does not mean self-denial but rather self-fulfillment. It does not mean compromise and sacrifice but an open-mindedness and reciprocal concession resulting from new insights. Such a sense of operation permits and compels each participant in the educative process to play a unique function, thus commanding the respect rightfully due every contributor to the educative function.[19]

Onofrio viewed the principal as an instrument of change and experimentation. His most rewarding roles are in helping his teachers construct and support policies and goals, in the evaluation of curriculum, in the selection of instructional materials, in school and class organizational structure, in pupil grouping, in pupil management, in developing pupil opportunities, in expanding roles and responsibilities of various staff positions, and in furthering other aspects of the school's total complex.[20]

No one expects the principal to completely abandon his managerial-administrative role to become an instructional leader. However,

---

[18]Jean B. McGrew, "Instruction: A Place for Principals," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LI (November, 1967), 54-56.

[19]Willard J. Congreve, "The Role of the Principal in School Improvement," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XLVIII (March, 1964), 3-9.

the flexibility of the principal's powers should allow him to do both. Present conditions demand that he exercise greater directional leadership in the quest for excellence which public education deserves. The principal must rise to the occasion by using his own personal talents, education, and foresightedness to lead his staff, students, and community toward establishing a realistic, creative, and far-reaching climate for the improvement of instruction.[21]

According to Shelton, no demand upon the principal's time should cause the principal's concern for the improvement of instruction to be overlooked. The purpose of each school and each teacher is to teach each pupil in the school to think and to operate at maximum efficiency. As head of the school, the principal usually has a major role in the hiring, supervising, and dismissing of teachers. In order to carry out this responsibility, he must develop a plan of classroom visitation and see that it is carried out.[22]

Wing considered staff development to be the primary responsibility of school administrators--particularly the building principal. Central office administrators may initiate, establish, and encourage in-service education. The director of pupil services can offer professional direction and leadership in this activity. Specialists may have interest and enthusiasm. Yet, all of these will be of little consequence without support from the principal. As a facilitator, the principal

---

[21]Onoforio.

[22]Landon Shelton, "Supervision of Teachers: The Administrator's First Responsibility," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XLIX (October, 1965), 31.

makes the difference in staff attendance and in staff involvement in developmental activities.[23]

Laabs considered the role and corresponding functions of the supervisory principal to be helping to identify problems, coordinating the various phases of problems, and providing the necessary conditions and resources for good teaching. If the principal is to accept this role, he must relinquish his authoritarian role and work with his staff as co-learners.[24]

It was McNally's thesis that a supervision-centered conception of the principalship has become both inappropriate and outdated. He considered an appropriate definition of the principal's role as that of a "perceptive generalist who is the professional leader of a group of fellow professionals." Rather than conforming to the image of a specialist in teaching techniques who is superivsor-manager of a group of quasi-professional teachers, the principal becomes the person to whom the professional teaching staff looks for leadership in coordinating and facilitating the school's professional program.[25]

McNally identified six role requirements of administrative leadership in the schools of tomorrow:

1. Principals must be able to provide leadership in the process of redefining and affirming the objectives of the school staff's

---

[23]Lucy Wing, "Staff Development Practices and Potentials," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LII (January, 1968), 23.

[24]Charles W. Laabs, "Supervisor of Instruction Primary Responsibility of the Junior High Principal," Clearing House, XLIII (December, 1968), 199.

[25]Harold J. McNally, "The American Principal Tomorrow," National Elementary Principal, XLVII (May, 1968), 85-86.

professional endeavors.

2. Principals must be able to become capable leaders in planning programs at both the building unit level and as members of the school district's educational planning team.

3. Principals must be able to secure, to deploy, and to coordinate resources and to facilitate the undertakings planned by and with the entire professional staff.

4. Principals must be able to provide leadership in mediating conflicts which arise in the increasingly complex schools.

5. Principals must be able to develop and maintain close school-community working relationships.

6. Principals must be able to utilize techniques of evaluation far more deliberately and consistently than ever before.[26]

Most of the writers in current educational journals felt that the major responsibiltiy of the principal must be providing educational leadership. Spears held that ideally the dominant functions of the high school principal's administration are (1) establishing conditions that will promote learning to an optimum degree on the part of both students and teachers; and (2) coordinating the educational services in the school so that they are of maximum value to everyone at Work in the school. According to Spears, the principal should recognize the importance of administrative controls that make possible the efficient and economical operation of his school, but at the same time he must be ever mindful of the importance of a permissive atmosphere which encourages initiative, cooperativeness, and industry among both the student body and the staff of the school.[27]

Stewart agreed that the principal's true function is educational

---

[26] McNally.

[27] Spears, "A Principal's Influence," 45.

leadership. He felt that the instructional program must be the principal's primary concern with all other duties and activities measured in relation to his function as an educational leader. According to Stewart, the principal should devote at least fifty-five per cent of his time to the supervision of instructional activities.[28]

Eulie summarized the function of the principal by stating, "No one person has greater influence upon every phase of school life than the principal. . . . The principal's influence is such that the school is molded in the image of the principal. . . . One poor teacher on a faculty is bad, but a weak principal can ruin a school's educational capacity. . . . The function of the principal is to so administer the school that teachers can teach and learning can take place.[29]

THE PRINCIPAL AND TEACHER EVALUATION

Evaluation of teachers is a vehicle which allows the principal to exercise leadership in the direction of instruction in his school. His judgment concerning the effectiveness of each teacher may contribute to the professional growth of that teacher. However, if this judgment is unsound, it may reduce a teacher's effectiveness as a guide to learning.[30]

Howsam stated that far too many principals, supervisors, and other administrators perform their teacher evaluation duties with the

---

[28] S. Gordon Stewart, "The Principal's Efficiency as an Instructional Leader," Virginia Journal of Education, LX (February, 1967), 18.

[29] Joseph Eulie, "It's Not the School--It's the Principal," American School Board Journal, CLIII (July, 1966), 19.

[30] John H. Hain and George J. Smith, "How Principals Rate Teachers," American School Board Journal, CLV (February, 1968), 17.

judgment of a laymen rather than with the educated insights of the professional. He considered a professional approach to teacher evaluation long overdue. The behavior that passes for systematic evaluation of teaching in many schools is shockingly inadequate and constitutes a blot on the education profession.[31]

Wilshaw contended that the evaluation of teacher performance and effectiveness in accordance with new teaching techniques, new methods, and new materials is becoming an increasingly monumental task. He proposed that principals, vice-principals, guidance counselors, supervisors, and superintendents be brought down to the grass roots level of education--the classroom--to see what really goes into planning and implementation of daily lessons, and, thus, into a genuine evaluation of the teacher's skill in carrying out his objective.[32]

Those who are concerned with teacher evaluation face a number of critical problems which demand some resolution. One of these problems is determining the relative status and role of the administrator and the teacher. Another problem concerns an entire complex of conflicts and disturbing realities which are created by the school as an organization. A third problem involves the actual task of identifying and evaluating teacher behavior. To the extent that evaluation is for organizational (accountability) purposes, teachers and administrators are likely to remain in conflict. To the extent that evaluation is for the purpose of self-evaluation, there is likely to be a relative absence

---

[31]Robert B. Howsam, "Teacher Evaluation: Facts and Folklore," National Elementary Principal, XLIII (November, 1963), 6.

[32]Donn R. Wilshaw, "Let's Take Another Look at Teacher Evaluation," New York State Education, LVI (February, 1969), 20.

of conflict.[33]

There is considerable evidence to support the view that the purpose of evaluation may be more important than any other aspect of the process. Howsam included the following purposes for which teacher evaluation might be undertaken: (1) to determine the effectiveness of the over-all instructional program (2) to determine the effectiveness of the school's personnel policies and procedures; (3) to provide the basis for supervisory and in-service programs and activities; (4) to facilitate accounting for responsibility; (5) to provide evidence for the basis of administrative decisions; (6) to motivate teachers to strive for a higher level of performance; (7) to provide the basis for rewards or sanctions; and (8) to assist the teacher in achieving professional success.[34]

A 1966 study of teacher evaluation in 336 elementary schools in the state of New York led Hain and Smith to reach the following conclusions about the evaluation of teachers:

1. The ratio of supervisors to teachers should be reduced to enable the principal to engage in effective supervision.
2. Observation should always be followed by a conference directed toward the improvement of the teacher's professional competence.
3. There should always be a written evaluation report, and the teacher should always have an opportunity to react to it.
4. Standards and procedures for supervision should be developed jointly by administrators and teachers.
5. Principals should consult with senior teachers about reappointment.

---

[33]Howsam, 8-11.

[34]Howsam, 13-14.

6. Jointly agreed upon standards and procedures for evaluation should be published and made available to teachers.[35]

Brighton maintained that teacher evaluation is an important means toward achieving educational goals and not an end in itself. He stated that the purposes of evaluation should usually be aimed at these functions: (1) to assess the over-all school program to determine how well it is progressing toward avowed goals; (2) to provide a basis for instructional improvement; (3) to motivate teachers to render their highest level of professional service; (4) to help teachers succeed in their chosen profession; (5) to provide a basis for making administrative decisions; (6) to provide a basis for developing more effective personnel policies; (7) to implement a merit pay plan; and (8) to keep records and reports for administrative offices and boards of education.[36]

Brighton cautioned that, before embarking on a program of assessing the effectiveness of teachers, the planning group must consider who is best qualified to conduct the evaluations. A factor to be considered is the expected change in relationships when the designated person assumes his new role. In practice, different individuals have been assigned the responsibility for evaluating the teaching process with varying degrees of success. These individuals include: (1) administrators; (2) peer groups; (3) pupils, using various types of rating techniques; and (4) the teachers, themselves, using self-rating or self-evaluating techniques.[37]

---

[35]Hain and Smith, 18.

[36]Staynor Brighton, Increasing Your Accuracy In Teacher Evaluation, (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1965), pp. 11-12.

[37]Brighton, 19.

Bradley stated that the development of an adequate program of teacher evaluation requires the careful attention to each of three factors: (1) the criterion for appraisal; (2) the quality of the measuring instrument; and (3) the professional competence and training of the evaluator. The criterion for teacher evaluation must constitute a definition of the teacher's role in society. This definition of the teacher's role in society and the teacher's efficiency must be made in measurable or observable terms.[38]

An instrument for teacher evaluation serves two distinct purposes. It should provide for an identification of what is to be observed and recorded, and it should provide for an evaluation of that which has been observed. The selection of statements from which scales are to be constructed should give priority to those which (1) are most significant in determining quality in teachers; (2) are most likely to be overlooked in actual practice and (3) provide for the collection of evidence with reasonable economy in time and effort.[39]

The validity, reliability, and consistency of the evaluation depend more upon the expertness of the evaluator than upon the evaluation instrument. The training program for evaluators should be designed for these specific purposes: (1) to develop a common underlying philosophy among the evaluators with respect to effective teaching; (2) to identify and compromise any difference in philosophy which may exist among the evaluators; (3) to develop a common interpretation of the meaning and

---

[38]Ruth Bradley, et. al., "A Design for Teacher Evaluation," National Elementary Principal, LXIII (November, 1963), 33-34.

[39]Bradley, 34.

significance of each item in the scale and the kind of evidence for which it calls; and (4) to develop a familiarity with each of the auxillary instruments used in both the observations and the interviews as well as familiarity with the instrument used to evaluate the information collected.[40]

Comments about the effects of teacher evaluation were solicited from forty-five principals in five school systems which were seriously attempting to develop better programs of teacher evaluation. This study led Rose to conclude that most teachers are not accustomed to being involved in a process of evaluation based on extensive criteria and a considerable amount of observation. The principals in the study reported that many teachers were nervous or tense when evaluation was initiated but that after a few contacts with the evaluation procedure, most teachers accepted or welcomed the experience when three conditions were met. These three conditions were: (1) the major focus was on improving teaching rather than on inspectorial fault finding; (2) the information produced by the evaluation was both meaningful and useful to the teacher; and (3) the principal took the necessary time to collect adequate information and to discuss it with the teacher.[41]

Redfern considered it important for the principal to establish rapport with the teacher if maximum results are to be achieved through evaluation. The teacher needs to feel that the principal respects him, that the principal is interested in him as a person, and that the principal is interested in him as a professional colleague. Although it may not

---

[40]Bradley, 34.

[41]Glen W. Rose, "The Effects of Administrative Evaluation," National Elementary Principal, XLIII (November, 1963), 51.

be possible or even desirable for a peer relationship to be formed, a rigid superior-subordinate relationship between the teacher and the principal detracts from an ideal appraisal climate. Best results prevail when a "climate of confidence" is established in the teacher-principal relationship.[42]

Klahn felt that evaluation of teachers will lack effectiveness unless a composite picture evolves from the contribution of many evaluators. Judgment based on the limited data and observations of one or two persons will neither alleviate the fear teachers have of evaluation nor will it promote action to change behavior. For evaluation to promote action for change, Klahn maintained that all persons concerned in the teaching-learning efforts must contribute to the process of evaluation. Klahn further stated that the principal should be involved in every step in the development of an appraisal program. The principal is in the best position to observe the educational activities of the classroom. Through his efforts at evaluation, the principal can help the teachers to raise questions and to maintain a critical attitude toward learning experiences.[43]

Brighton cautioned that the power to rate and the power to evaluate a teacher places a potent weapon in the hand of the principal. If a principal allows an evaluation program to be used in an arbitrary or undemocratic manner, he will not only be guilty of an unprofessional

---

[42]George B. Redfern, How To Appraise Teaching, (Columbus, Ohio: School Management Institute, 1963), p. 100.

[43]Richard P. Klahn, Evaluation of Teacher Competency, (Milwaukee: The Franklin Co., 1965), pp. 16-18.

approach to the serious matter of teacher evaluation, but he will probably never again be able to achieve the essential purposes for which an evaluation should be established.[44]

THE PRINCIPAL AND STUDENT DISSENT

The year 1968 may well be remembered as the year of high school student unrest and activism. Examples of this student activity can be found in high schools in small town and suburban centers as well as in large metropolitan centers. The mechanism of student dissent continues to spread very rapidly. Ashbaugh stated that the administrator who says that it cannot happen in his school system is as naive as those administrators who a few years ago said that teacher militancy would not catch on.[45]

A survey conducted by the National Association of Secondary School Principals in January, 1969 showed that protest activity was widespread among high school students and that it was on the increase. Fifty-nine per cent of the respondents indicated that some form of protest had occurred in their schools. Eighty-two per cent of the principals of schools which had experienced protests said that school regulations were under attack; forty-five per cent indicated that the school's instructional program was being criticized; and twenty-five per cent reported some activism concerning national issues.[46]

---

[44]Brighton, p. 13.

[45]Carl R. Ashbaugh, "High School Student Activism: Nine Tested Approaches for Coping With Conflict Situations," Nation's Schools, LXXXIII (February, 1969), 94.

[46]Jane Hurst, "Principals Report on Student Protest," American Education, V (October, 1969), 4-5.

A report prepared for the United States Office of Education by researchers at the University of Michigan analyzed teacher and student views on high school disorders. They identified four causes as being most contributive to school disruptions: (1) interracial tensions among students; (2) outside agitators and mass media; (3) permissive upbringing of children and normal adolescent rebelliousness; and (4) student disrespect for teachers.[47]

When teachers were asked what changes in the school they would most like to see to meet the current phase of student activism, the most popular response was "tighter discipline," followed by "changes in the curriculum," and "better administration." When questioned about who should influence school policies, teachers strongly desired reducing the influence of superintendents, increasing the influence of principals and teachers, and maintaining the current level of student influence.[48]

On the basis of the USOE's study of student unrest, Anrig made the following recommendations:

1. All schools should follow the lead pioneered by some urban districts in increasing involvement and sharing real power with teachers, students, and parents.

2. Alternatives must be sought to the "tight ship syndrome" which characterizes the regimented life of a student.

3. New and broader areas of communication with students must be developed.

4. A greater relevancy in learning must be developed--relevancy to the world of work and relevancy to the community with which the school identifies.

---

[47]Gregory R. Anrig, "Trouble in the High School," American Education, V (October, 1969), 2-3.

[48]Anrig, 2-3.

5. Changes must be brought about in the ways of selecting and training those who enter the critical role of the secondary school principalship.

6. Pressures must be brought to bear upon schools of education to recruit more selectively, educate more effectively, and screen more effectively those who enter the educational profession.

7. Those who have some power in the business of education must be more willing to look at themselves critically, to justify their own actions and reactions regarding those who confront them, and to change their attitudes.[49]

Sproule viewed student activism as a reality which can be channeled into a constructive force to add a real vitality to the high school educational program. He maintained that components of a design which would legitimate student dissent yet maintain the integrity of the purpose of the high school include:

1. The board of education must view the reality of the situation and establish district wide policy guidelines dealing with student disruptions.

2. Direct communication with students must be established.

3. An administrative "open-door" policy should be established to show students that administrators are truly concerned about student problems.

4. The student council--recognized as a legitimate, representative, and responsible body--should be truly representative of the student body.

5. The greatest opportunity to deal with student activism is in the area of curriculum development.[50]

Moyers offered three suggestions to educators facing the growing intensity of student dissent. These are:

---

[49]Anrig, 3-4.

[50]Joseph R. Sproule, "A Potentially Constructive Force, National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LIII (September, 1969), 23-27.

1. Take the dissenter seriously. What they are saying is important, even if they are obnoxious in saying it. Instead of an angry reaction, try to take seriously the deep, moral concern of the student.

2. Recognize and encourage the creative forms of dissent, even when they appear at odds with conventional wisdom. At least discuss these problems openly without trying to brush them under the desk.

3. Give students some of the action which they are demanding. A serious mistake will be made by waiting until after demonstrations and protests have erupted to take a new look at the old way of doing things.[51]

Spears stated that the individual high school student should share in making the decisions which affect him in school. He is convinced that pupils have ideas which are worth hearing. According to Spears, if an attentive ear is turned to their ideas, boys and girls will be more willing to listen to the "wisdcm" of adults.[52]

Spears further stated that a well-disciplined school is conducive to an effective instructional program. Conversely, it can be said that a meaningful instructional program is the very basis of a well-disciplined school. Spears subscribed to the idea that the disciplining of students should be viewed as an element in the development of self-control. Young people should develop a sense of responsibility for their own behavior.[53] Reaching this goal can not be left to chance.

Ashbaugh suggested that the following approaches could serve as guidelines for schools to use in handling conflict situations:

---

[51]Bill Moyers, "Student Dissent--And What To Do About It," Texas Outlook, LII (December, 1968), 24-26.

[52]Spears, 47.

[53]Spears, 48.

1. Maintain lines of communication. Not only are students and school personnel involved, but parents, law enforcement officials, and representatives of local government may either seek or be asked to play a role in resolving conflict.

2. Control influences and enforce attendance. Outsiders can ignite a potentially explosive situation or keep fanning the fires of revolt.

3. Talk with student leaders. Agree to have a discussion on the issues with the leaders on the grounds that the other demonstrators maintain order.

4. Consider third-party mediation.

5. Identify student demands. The formal presentation of demands should be considered crucial to the entire settlement procedure.

6. Respond to student demands. After the students' demands are formalized, the professional staff can then prepare their response.

7. Hear all viewpoints. Because the issues can often involve far-reaching ramifications, recommendations are needed from more than one individual, from more than one department, and from more than one point of view.

8. Decide on a definite course of action.

9. Institutionalize student participation. By thorough and insightful planning, educators can assure themselves that student involvement will be by evolutionary rather than revolutionary means.[54]

Harris aptly summarized the problem of student dissent by stating.

> There are no pat answers to today's educational patterns of crises. There always has been and always will be student unrest. Unrest, in itself, is the impetus which gives a spurt toward the solution of perplexing difficulties in which a society finds itself hopelessly entangled . . . .
> . . . Educators should want change. It should be welcomed. Education . . . is designed to bring about changes in behaviorial and thought characteristics. These changes should enrich problem-solving techniques. There has to be a creative stimulus,

---

[54]Ashbaugh, 94-96.

and there must be a creative response.[55]

THE PRINCIPAL AND PROFESSIONAL NEGOTIATIONS

A power struggle exists within the educational profession between the teachers on one hand and boards of education on the other. Young stated that the new force in education represented by teacher power is long overdue. He maintained that educational problems do not arise from this new force and the rightful involvement of teachers in matters that affect them, but that problems arise from the tactics and procedures employed in the process by the teachers and the administrators.[56]

The movement toward professional negotiations agreements in the public schools seem to be gaining momentum. Michael reported that as of June 1, 1967 approximately thirty-four per cent of the nation's teachers were teaching in states where some type of negotiations agreement was mandatory. Predictions have been made that by 1972 about eighty per cent of the nation's teachers will be teaching in states which provide some type of negotiations agreement or will actually be engaged in professional negotiations which will require significant changes in the management of the public schools.[57]

The introduction of trade unionism in teacher-school board relations has brought a marked change in the position of all school

---

[55]Mary Imogene Harris, "Does Oklahoma Face Student Unrest?" The Oklahoma Teacher, LI (September, 1969), 25.

[56]William F. Young, "Curriculum Negotiations: Present Status--Future Trends," Educational Leadership, XXVI (January, 1969), 341-342.

[57]Lloyd S. Michael, "The Principal and Trends in Professional Negotiations," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LII (May, 1968), 105.

supervisory personnel--particularly to the position of the school principal. Taffel stated that the effect of professional negotiations has been to isolate the principal between the school board and the teachers' negotiating unit. With the introduction of a militant teacher ideology, a separation has been produced between the principal and his staff. The friendly professionalism which has characterized the relationship between the principal and the individual teacher has been replaced by more formal and impersonal relationships with the teacher bargaining agent.[58]

Many argue that the negotiations process has made the principal a forgotten man in education. If he is regarded as a part of the school management team, as most teachers' units regard him, he not only suffers a degree of alienation in his relationship with the teachers, but his exclusion from representation in the teachers' negotiating unit is a foregone conclusion.[59]

Brant saw the principal as clearly being drawn toward the management role in negotiations. The traditional loyalties of the principal are under stress. Sometimes principals have found it desirable to shield and buffer their teachers from the central office and the board. At other times, they have perceived their official roles to be a part of management. Brant considered it essential for principals to be represented on the district's negotiating team. He felt that since agreements which are "administered" at the building level are reached

---

[58]Alexander Taffel, "The Principal and Teacher-School Board Negotiations," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LII (September, 1968), 71-83.

[59]George B. Redfern, "Negotiations Change Principal-Teacher Relationships," National Elementary Principal, XLVII (April, 1968), 20.

in negotiations, a principal or two should be designated to participate on the superintendent's negotiating team.[60]

Epstein felt that principals see no ominous threat to themselves in professional negotiations. They do, however, view their absence from negotiations as being an abnormal situation. They feel that their presence in negotiating sessions would produce agreements which are more workable and which would be more satisfactory to all participants.[61]

In a 1966 statement about professional negotiations in the local school district, the American Association of School Administrators maintained.

> Local associations made up of teachers, supervisors, principals, and administrators working together in close harmony best serve the cause of education. Whatever the pattern of representation or organization eventually chosen, no teacher, supervisor, principal, or administrator should be unrepresented in the process.[62]

Michael stated that the greatest problem facing the secondary principal today is his attempt to fulfill his role as an instructional leader and as a manager of change while his position continues to grow more precarious and untenable due to the developing schism among teachers, boards of education, and chief school administrators.[63]

According to Michael, principals have met the challenge to

---

[60]Glen H. Brant, "Changing Roles of the School Superintendent," Seattle. School Information and Research Service, February, 1968. (Mimeographed.)

[61]Benjamin Epstein, "Why Principals Want to Negotiate for Themselves," Nation's Schools, LXXVOO (October, 1966), 66-67.

[62]American Association of School Administrators, School Administrators View Professional Negotiations, (Washington, D.C. AASA, 1966), p. 38.

[63]Michael, "Principal and Trends in Professional Negotiations," 107.

their role in essentially two ways: "We will have business as usual or we will set up a business of our own." Michael feels that in the "business as usual" approach, principals are losing ground in their attempt to have a voice in and to make a contribution to their school's program. As they seek to bypass the superintendent and to go directly to the board of education, teachers are either ignoring principals or they are including them in their negotiating unit. Either course severely limits administrative prerogatives which previously were within the province of the building administrator.[64]

In the second approach, principals band together to protect their own rights by emulating strong union or teachers' organizations. School principals become militant and build up their own organizations to have a more effective voice. This "solution" tends to solidify all battle lines and to widen the breach among the four major groups concerned: teachers, boards of education, superintendents, and principals.[65]

The National Education Association's Guidelines for Professional Negotiations stated:

> An integral part of the professional negotiation process is the use of professional channels--the administrative channels of the school system. Administrators, therefore, should be directly involved in the process and not automatically bypassed or forced into roles they do not wish to play.[66]

Epstein stated that the upsurge of teacher militancy is raising

---

[64]Michael, 107.

[65]Michael, 107.

[66]National Education Association, Guidelines for Professional Negotiation, (Washington, D.C.: Office of Professional Development and Welfare, NEA, 1965), p. 3.

many questions about traditional hierarchial practices in public education. It is forcing a redefinition of the powers, the authority, and the range of discretion of school boards, of the central school administration, and of the school principal and his staff. Teachers are coming to look upon the superintendent, the principal, and the remainder of the administrative staff less as colleagues, educational leaders, and persons from whom to seek guidance and help. Rather, administrators are increasingly viewed as managerial representatives of the employer who are barriers to the free exercise of the teachers' collective will.[67]

In the pioneer phases of teacher-board negotiations and joint policy making, the role of the principal has not been clearly defined or established. There are some who would argue that the principal has no role at all. In some localities, the principal has been included as part of the general teachers' negotiating team. In other localities, superintendents and school boards have invited principals and other administrative personnel to serve either as consultants or as participants on the administrative negotiating team. In many localities, principals have not been involved in the decisive phases of agreement writing. When left out of the procedure, principals and other administrators have begun to feel themselves in the middle of a squeeze play in which their duties and responsibilities are increasing while their power and authority are being diminished by the agreement and policies which result from professional negotiations.[68]

---

[67]Benjamin Epstein, "The NASSP and Collective Negotiations," Readings on Collective Negotiations in Public Education, Stanley M. Elam, Myron Lieberman, and Michael H. Moscow (eds.), (Chicago: Rand McNally & co., 1967), p. 187.

[68]Epstein, 188.

Principals are beginning to seek a more clearly defined role at the bargaining table. Since so much of the negotiations between the teacher and the school board impinges upon the functions and the status of the principal, they are seeking participation in negotiations--less as part of the general professional unit and more as either an independent or as part of the administrative negotiating team. Among the reasons for the principals' desire to become involved in negotiation and agreement writing, Epstein included: (1) principals are worried about the fact that in many agreements they receive inequity of treatment (2) principals find certain things being written into agreements which are unmanageable and impractical (3) principals consider some items which are included in agreements to be educationally harmful and professionally unjustifiable; and (4) principals feel that their presence would produce more workable and satisfactory agreements.[69]

Schooling maintained that no matter how conscientiously a school organization seeks to involve all personnel in a professional negotiations agreement, suspicion, distrust, and occasional hostility will characterize the teacher-administrator relationship. He further stated that few problems are of greater importance than those related to unifying the purpose and dedication of a total profession. Only by bringing the total professional interest to bear in the effort to provide better educational opportunities will education be able to combat the common foes--inadequate financial support, apathy and indifference.[70]

---

[69]Epstein, 188.

[70]H. W. Schooling, "Teacher-Administrator Relationships," NEA Journal, XLIV (February, 1965), 34.

THE PRINCIPALS AND FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

The impact of federal involvement in education has been felt increasingly in the last decade across the United States. Today, local and state educational authorities must share responsibility for decision-making with the federal government. Pierce made the statement that the impact of the federal government's program is not consistent, amounts of money are uncertain, and the specific help offered may be incompatible with the current needs of a school system.[71]

The American Association of School Administrators stated that the federal government can contribute much to American education. Some improvements can only be achieved through federal action while others can be greatly advanced by federal cooperation. They emphasized, however, that vigorous state and local leadership must be preserved in the emerging local-state-national partnership.[72]

Many authors considered the increased level of federal activities in education to mark the decline of local control of education. Lieberman felt that the decline of local control of education was not only one of the most important trends, but also that it is a trend that was long overdue. He based this thesis upon the growing acceptance of the idea that a child's chances in life would not be dependent upon either his community's

---

[71]Wendell H. Pierce, "The Impact of Federal Involvement on Significant Social Issues," Federal Policy and the Public Schools, (Washington, D.C.: AASA, 1967), pp. 25-27.

[72]American Association of School Administrators, The Federal Government and the Public Schools. (Washington, D.C.. AASA, 1965), p. 61.

ability or willingness to educate him.[73]

In considering the role of the federal government in education and the type of federal aid which should be directed to the schools, the Educational Policies Commission made the following recommendation:

> If education is to be excellent, the schools have a dire need for federal funds. The federal government, therefore, has an indispensable role to play in education. The federal government, however, cannot play that role effectively as long as it follows the categorical approach only--that is, as long as it insists on making the educational decision itself. General aid may be politically beyond the possible in present circumstances. But it should be made the main aim to move in that direction now.[74]

Local schools have expressed concern about the 'federal crash programs" which descend upon them without time to prepare budgets, without time to find space, or without time to employ personnel. Concern has been expressed about maintaining a balanced educational program in the face of financial incentives to direct resources to federally aided activities. Concern has been expressed about staff time devoted to writing proposals and preparing reports for federal agencies.[75]

Saylor considered the following indictments to be the most serious concerning the restrictive and wasteful nature of the acts of the United States Office of Education in administering federal grants to education:

1. The USOE is all-powerful in determining what institution, school system, agency, researcher, or institute is to receive

---

[73] Myron Lieberman, The Future of Public Education, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960), pp. 34-35.

[74] Educational Policies Commission, Federal Financial Relationships to Education, (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1967), p. 19.

[75] AASA, Federal Government and Public Schools, 62-63.

support for particular projects and in what amounts; thus, there is the distinct possibility of extreme bias in determining funding of projects.

2. Sound and efficient administration of educational agencies has been hampered by the uncertainty of approval, funding, and continuity of programs.

3. Many imaginative and forward-looking educators are prevented from actually developing meritorious and innovative projects because of unwarranted requirements in preparing applications for federal funds.

4. The categorical types of aid encourage a school district to develop a particular phase of its program--often to the detriment of the total program.

5. An integrated program of educational development is discouraged by the multiplicity of federal funding agencies and the ineptness of many local community action agencies.

6. The establishment of regional offices of the USOE would constitute a serious threat to the authority of state departments of education.[76]

Saylor concluded that what we primarily need in the administration of programs of federal support in education is complete confidence, on the part of those who administer the funds, in the capabilities, integrity, farsightedness, and vision of officials of the local school system.[77]

Campbell felt that a number of influences, both in government and out of government, tend to nationalize the nation's schools and colleges. He conducted a study to determine the extent of certain nationalizing influences in secondary schools, the contributuion of these influences to the standardization of educational programs, and the extent to which these influences represented a shift in decision-making from the

---

[76]J. Galen Saylor, "Captive to Funded Projects?" Educational Leadership, XXVI (January, 1969), 328-334.

[77]Saylor, 334.

local-state level to the national level. A case study examination was conducted in seven high schools whose enrollments ranged from 700 to 4100 and whose social class ranged from upper-lower to upper-middle. The following purported national influences were examined: professional associations of teachers and administrators, the regional accrediting associations, the Division of Scientific Personnel and Education of the National Science Foundation, the philanthropic foundations, the College Entrance Examination Board, the National Merit Scholarship Program and a miscellaneous category called special interest groups.[78]

Data obtained by the study led the investigator to conclude that national influences do seem to be affecting the secondary schools. The strongest influences on the schools were the CEEB, the USF, and the NDEA. There did appear to be a movement toward standardization, since these influences are national groups and are calling for national programs. The most influential groups toward standardization appeared to be the NDEA and the CEEB. Five of the influences studied were national in character and tended to ignore the traditional local-state approach to educational problems.[79]

In order to assess the impact of the National Science Foundation, the National Defense Education Act, the College Entrance Examination Board, and the National Merit Scholarship Program, a statewide questionnaire study was conducted in Illinois in 1962 by the Midwest Administration Center. Data gathered during the study led Ptak and

---

[78]Roald F. Campbell, "Exploratory Studies," Nationalizing Influences in Secondary Education, Roald Campbell and Robert Bunnel, editors, (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, 1963) pp. 13-14.

[79]Campbell, "Exploratory Studies," 20-23.

Bunnel to conclude that these four influences have had a considerable impact on the high schools. They have brought about changes in course content, addition of new courses to the curriculum, increased academic training of teachers, added to facilities and equipment, and introduced special forms of preparation for the various testing programs employed.[80]

Campbell and Bunnel summarized the various influences of national programs on secondary education with the following statements: (1) national programs have substantially changed the courses offered in science, mathematics, and foreign languages in the high schools; (2) national programs have altered guidance programs of the high schools; (3) national programs have created a vast external testing program for high school students; (4) national programs have changed college admission procedures for high school students; (5) national programs have established a new pattern of inservice education for teachers, (6) national programs have altered school plant planning and construction; and (7) national programs have given the public a new measure with which to evaluate schools.[81]

THE PRINCIPAL AND PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

The high school principalship is rapidly becoming a position demanding a specialized, intensive professional training beyond the bachelor's degree which is comparable to that of the dentist, physician, or attorney. Most states have provided administrative certification to furnish recognition of special training for educational administration

---

[80]Stanley Ptak and Robert Bunnel, "The Impact on Public High Schools," ibid., 85-102.

[81]Roald Campbell and Robert Bunnel, "Impact and Implications," ibid., 119-124.

and to insure at least some specialized training on the part of those occupying administrative positions. Douglas stated that the training required for these certificates should be thought of as only a minimum rather than as constituting an optimum.[82]

Davis and Nickerson felt that certification standards and requirements will provide a basis for the selection of a new principal. Most states require at least a master's plus some administrative experience for administrative certification. A few states are increasing requirements to include a six-year degree which may be labled a Specialist Certificate, Professional Diploma, Advanced Certificate, or some other such term.[83]

Stinnett indicated that the most dramatic upgrading of educational certification has occurred in the administrative field--particularly for elementary and secondary principals and for superintendents. In 1967, forty-eight states required the master's degree or higher preparation for certificaiton as a secondary principal; three required six years of preparation; eight required more than the master's degree but less than six years of preparation; and thirty-seven required the master's degree or five years preparation. Only three states issued a certificate for secondary school principals on less than the master's degree. Only one state did not issue specific certification for secondary school principals.[84]

The University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA)

---

[82]Douglas, Modern Administration of Secondary Schools, p. 21.

[83]Donald E. Davis and Neal C. Nickerson, Jr., Critical Issues in School Personnel Administration, (Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1968) p. 32.

[84]T. M. Stinnett, A Manual on Certification Requirements in the United States, 1967, (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1967), pp. 17-19.

stated that the standards of the past are insufficient to meet the quality needs of the present and the future. They stated that the administrator of the future will need the following: (1) a higher degree of intelligence than in the past becuase education will be more complex; (2) a better education because the general citizenery will be better educated; (3) more vision becuase educational problems and their solutions will be more far-reaching; (4) more courage because the need for change and improvement will be greater; and (5) more ability because more will be expected.[85]

The UCEA noted that substantial change in certification requirements have occurred for both teachers and administrators in the past decade. They indicated that most changes have been in the direction of less formal requirements and more flexibility. They expected the idea that this flexibility, coupled with a multi-disciplinary approach to the preparation of educational leaders, should encourage students to begin preparation for positions of leadership in education early in their careers.[86]

McIntyre stated that there is little evidence that teaching experience beyond the first four or five years contributes to the effectiveness of either administration or further teaching. He concluded, therefore, that the career line into educational administration should be shortened so that ability can be unleashed as soon as it is clearly

---

[85]The University Council for Educational Administration, The Selective Recruitment of Educational Leaders: A UCEA Position Paper, (Columbus, Ohio: UCEA, 1966), p. 8.

[86]UCEA, Selective Recruitment, p. 10.

recognized.[87]

McIntyre further stated that educational administration must be a more exclusive profession than in the past. He felt that one necessary step which must be taken is to accredit, for school administrator preparation purposes, only as many of the strongest institutions as are required to meet the demand. He considered another essential measure to be a universally and uniformly administered, interpreted, and reported aptitude test. He felt that it was extremely important that institutions preparing school administrators have some acceptable and effective manner of comparing their results.[88]

In discussing the proper content of curriculum for the development of potential school administrators, Culbertson suggested that the curriculum should develop those behaviors which are appropriate for dealing with the process of decision-making. He emphasized that concepts and theories which are incorporated into preparatory programs should have more than a logical relationship to this process. He noted that scope and quality are also important considerations.[89]

Walton recommended that a program for the education of educational administrators should contain the following elements:

1. All educational administrators should have a broad, liberal education, for which four years of undergraduate work is not too much.

---

[87]Kenneth E. McIntyre, Selection of Educational Administrators, (Columbus, Ohio: UCEA, 1966), p. 7.

[88]McIntyre, 7.

[89]Jack Culbertson, "The Preparation of Administrators," Behavioral Science and Educational Administration Yearbook, (Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1964), pp. 316-317.

2. Most educational administrators should have some teaching experience. If not, a fifth year program in teacher education and two years teaching experience should intervene before they go on to their professional education in administration.

3. The curriculum for the preparation of educational administrators should be organized in an interdisciplinary approach.

4. The curriculum should include: (a) no more than three semester seminars in the social sciences--government, public finance, and social organizations; (b) a year long seminar in educational administration; (c) a semester seminar in government of education; and (d) a year long seminar in the literature of education.[90]

Simulation, as a method of training educational administrators, has received careful scrutiny in recent years. Cunningham indicated that the simulated situation offered these distinct advantages: (1) it brings a degree of realism to thinking about administrative behavior that is lacking when it is studied in other ways; (2) it provides an important way to relate theoretical concepts to practical problems; (3) it permits students of administration to look upon their own behavior while engaged in a non-threatening situation and (4) it exposes students to a broad range of administrative concepts.[91]

Moore and Trusty felt that the use of simulated materials pointed out more clearly the limitations of some of the more restricted and conventional approaches that have been used in teaching potential leaders.[92] McNally and Wynn noted that simulation is not a panacea nor

---

[90]John Walton, "The Education of Educational Administrators," Preparing Administrators: New Perspectives, Jack Culbertson & Stephen Hencley, (eds.), (Columbus, Ohio: UCEA 1962), pp. 95-99.

[91]Luverne L. Cunningham, "The Use of Simulated Situations at the University of Chicago," Simulation in Administrative Training, (Columbus, Ohio: UCEA, 1960), pp. 18-19.

[92]Hollis A. Moore, Jr. and Francis M. Trusty, "The Use of Simulated Situations at Stanford University," ibid., p. 27.

a substitute for all other instructional methods. They did, however, think that simulation showed exciting possibilities for the preparation of educational administrators.[93] Culbertson thought that one of the major advantages from using simulated materials was that it brought the professor and the practitioner closer together, thus, providing a better base for meaningful communication.[94]

McIntyre stated that the burden of responsibility for improving the principalship should rest upon several agencies and organizations. State certification standards should place a premium on quality rather than on the perfunctory accumulation of credits. State accreditation of institutions for principalship training should be limited to the few which offer creditable preparation programs. Professional associations are in a position to render leadership in the improvement of the school principalship. Colleges and universities should be prepared to provide expert consultant services needed by local school systems which set up local training programs. They should also become centers for conducting and coordinating research that can not be done in the local system. Superintendents and boards of education have the responsibility for the actual provision of local in-service training programs for the principalship. Finally, the performance of the principal, himself,

---

[93]Harold A. Moore, Jr. and Francis C. Trusty, "The Use of Simulated Situations at Teacher's College, Columbia University," ibid., p. 37.

[94]Jack A. Culbertson, "Simulated Situations and Instruction: A Critique," ibid., p. 46.

is the most critical determinant of the undertaking to improve the position of the high school principalship.[96]

---

[96]Kenneth E. McIntrye, Selection and On-The-Job Training of School Principals, (Bureau of Laboratory Schools, Publication No. 12, Austin. The University of Texas Press, 1960), pp. 98-100.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

An investigation was conducted to determine the characteristics of the Texas high school principal and to determine the principal's attitudes toward selected educational issues. The high school principals selected for participation in the study were divided into five scholastic groups as outlined in Chapter I.

A random sample of thirty-five per cent of all principals in each of the five groups was conducted. A total of 381 questionnaires was sent to the principals selected for participation in the study. A total of 289 principals, or 75.85 per cent, responded to the questionnaire. The breakdown of the 289 responding principals is as follows: Class B, 76; Class A, 53; Class AA, 57; Class AAA, 44; and Class AAAA, 59.

Responses to the questions are reported in this chapter in narrative form. Means and/or medians are shown for those questions concerned with the background of the Texas high school principal.

I. GENERAL BACKGROUND

Question 1. How Would You Classify Your School's Scholastic Population?

According to the responses of the principals, 44 per cent of the Texas high schools were located in areas that could be considered predominantly rural and agricultural. Over 20 per cent of the principals

reported that their schools were approximately evenly divided between rural and urban students. Almost one-third reported that their students were mostly from an urban background. From responses to the question, it seemed apparent that the size of the school is directly related to the type of population it serves.

Question 2. How Long Have You Been a High School Principal?

More than 55 per cent of the Texas high school principals indicated that they have served as a high school principal for five years or less. Over 80 per cent have served as high school principal for ten years or less. The mean of years of service for the total sample was 7.08 and the median was 4.90.

Question 3. How Long Have You Been a School Principal in This District?

Responses to the question indicated that most principals had served in their present school district a relatively short period of time. The mean of years of service as high school principal in the present district was 6.55 and the median was 4.56.

Question 4. How Many Different High School Principalships Have You Held?

Responses to the question indicated that most high school principals have remained fairly stable in their position. Over 70 per cent of the sample indicated that only one high school principalship had been held. Less than 5 per cent of the sample had held more than three different principalships. The mean for the sample was 1.45 and the median was 1.20. Little variation was noted in the responses of the five groups of principals in the sample.

II. PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL

Question 5: What Is Your Sex?

The high school principalship in Texas seemed to be a predominantly male occupation. Only three of the 289 respondents were female.

Question 6: What Is Your Age?

The mean age of the Texas high school principal was 43.70. Only Class B, which had a mean age of 39.61, and Class AAAA, which had a mean age of 49.53, differed greatly from the mean for the total sample. In only two groups, Class B and Class A, were there any principals below the age of 30. The median age of the high school principal was 42.51.

Question 7: What Is Your Marital Status?

The overwhelming majority of principals in the survey were married. Of the 289 principals, 282 indicated that they were presently married. Since there was only one principal who reported a divorced marital status, it appeared that superintendents and school boards preferred a married man as high school principal.

Question 8: How Many Children Do You Have?

The majority of respondents to the question reported that they had one or more children. Only 23 of the 289 principals in the study reported that they had no children. For the sample, the mean number of children was 2.32 and the median was 1.79.

Question 9: What Is Your Present Degree Status?

No participant in the study reported less than a bachelors degree. Over 38 per cent of the respondents reported the masters degree as the highest level attained. Over 40 per cent of the principals had earned 15-29 semester hours above the masters degree and 11 per cent had earned 30-60 semester hours above the masters degree. Only three principals from the sample had earned the doctorate degree. Principals of larger schools, AA and AAAA, showed a higher percentage of principals who had advanced above the masters degree level than did the principals of smaller schools.

Question 10. In What Year Was Your Last Degree Earned?

Over 40 per cent of the principals earned their last degree during the 1960's. About 10 per cent earned their last degree prior to 1950. The only exception to these results was the AAAA group in which over 25 per cent earned the last degree prior to 1950 and about 13 per cent after 1960. Responses to Question 9, however, indicated that most principals from this group had taken additional college work after the completion of their last degree.

Question 11: What College or University Granted Your Last Degree?

Responses to the question indicated that over 93 per cent of the Texas high school principals earned their last degree in a college or university in the state. The two leading institutions for training high school principals were East Texas State University and North Texas State University. Other institutions which prepared more than 5 per cent of the state's high school principals included: Sam Houston State University, Stephen F. Austin State University, Southwest Texas State University and West Texas State

University.

Question 12. In What Area Did You Major on the Undergraduate Level?

Physical education or social studies was the undergraduate major of more than 50 per cent of the participants in the study. The only major difference in undergraduate majors of principals by groups was that eleven of the fourteen principals who had an industrial arts major were in AAA or AAAA high schools. Percentages were fairly constant throughout the five groups for all other majors.

Question 13. On the Masters Level, What Was Your Major?

Over 85 per cent of the 271 principals with at least a masters degree majored in either educational administration or education. Almost 50 per cent majored in educational administration and over 36 per cent majored in education. Only about 3 per cent majored in the third ranking area-- social studies.

Question 14. What Was Your Major on the Doctoral Level?

Only three principals reported an earned doctorate degree. Each of these was a principal of a AAAA school and each had a major in educational administration.

Question 15: How Many Classes Do You Regularly Teach?

Over 65 per cent of the principals reported that no classes are taught on a regular basis. No AAAA principal taught a class. Only one AAA principal taught a class and this was due to personal preference. Four AA principals taught on a regular basis. Over half of the Class A principals taught one or more classes. Over 89 per cent of the Class B principals taught one or more classes.

Almost 40 per cent of the Class B principals taught four or more classes which indicated that their assignment was primarily instructional rather than administrative.

Question 16: How Many Years Have You Been Employed in a Professional Educational Position?

For the entire sample, the mean of years employed in a professional educational position was 13.35. The median was 16.93 years. Only Class AAAA was well above the mean and the median and only Class B was well below both.

Question 17. How Many Years Were You a Teacher Before Your First Administrative Position?

For the sample, the mean of years employed as a teacher before the first administrative position was 8.05 and the median was 6.58. Over 70 per cent of the principals were in education less than ten years before they were first appointed to an administrative position.

Question 18. What School Position Did You Hold Immediately Before First Becoming a High School Principal?

Immediately before becoming high school principals, almost 20 per cent of the respondents were coaches. While only 5 per cent of the AAAA principals moved to the principalship directly from the coaching ranks, almost 24 per cent had been a coach before moving into administration. Over 14 per cent of the principals moved to the high school principalship from an assistant principalship. This was true of over 29 per cent of AAA principals and 37 per cent of AAAA principals. Few Class B, A, or AA principals first served as an assistant principal. Over 12 per cent were elementary principals

and over 11 per cent were junior high school principals immediately before moving to the high school principalship.

Question 19. Before Going Into Administration, What Was Your Basic Teaching Experience?

Nearly one-fourth of the principals reported that their basic teaching experience was coaching. Almost 15 per cent had been math teachers, over 16 per cent had been science teachers, and almost 18 per cent had been social studies teachers. The basic experience of over 7 per cent of the principals had been that of an elementary teacher. No other position had been the basic experience of as many as 5 per cent of the principals.

Question 20. In What Professional Organizations Do You Hold Membership?

All of the 289 principals responding to the survey indicated that they were members of the Texas State Teachers Association. Over 41 per cent held membership in the National Education Association. Almost 66 per cent of the principals held membership in the Texas Association of Secondary School Principals. Almost 45 per cent of the participants were members of the National Association of Secondary School Principals. Phi Delta Kappa was the only other professional organization to which more than 10 per cent of the principals belonged.

Question 21: Including the Lunch Hour, How Many Hours Do You Usually Devote to Your Position?

Over 75 per cent of the principals indicated that they devoted nine or more hours to their position each day. Only 7 per cent indicated less than eight hours daily. The median of daily hours spent on the job was 9.26. There was little variation from this

median from any of the five classifications of principals.

Question 22: How Many Hours Do You Usually Spend at School on Saturdays?

More than half of the principals reported that they usually spend no time at school on Saturdays. The mean for the group was 0.95 hours. There was little variation in the hours worked on Saturday by any of the five groups.

Question 23. What Is Your Annual Salary?

There is a wide range in salaries for principals among the five groups. For all principals, the median was $11,933. By groups, the median salary was: B, $8,870 A, $10,578; AA, $11,777; AAA, $12,350 and AAAA, $14,281. Although almost 40 per cent of the principals earned less than $11,001, no AAAA principal and only five AAA principals earned less than this amount. Twenty Class B and five Class A principals reported earning less than $8,000 annually, while four AAAA principals reported earning more than $17,701.

Question 24--A Do You Plan to Eventually Move to a Position Other Than the High School Principalship?

Almost 48 per cent of the principals indicated that they do plan to move to some position other than the high school principalship, over 20 per cent indicated that they are uncertain about whether they will seek a different position; and only 32 per cent indicated that they definitely do not plan to seek some other position. A greater percentage of small school principals indicated that they had plans to seek a different position than did the principals of larger schools.

Question 24-B: If You Do Plan to Move to a Position Other Than the High School Principalship, What Will It Be?

Of the 133 principals who indicated that they did plan to leave the high school principalship, 50 per cent planned to move to a school superintendency. About 13 per cent merely indicated that they will seek some other educational position. Only three principals stated that they planned to leave the educational profession.

Question 25. If Conditions Were Ideal, How Do You Think Your Time Might Be Distributed So as to Perform the Work of the Principal Most Effectively?

Principals from each of the five groups surveyed agreed fairly closely on the ideal distribution of time. A composite view of all responses to the question indicated that principals would like to allocate their time in the following manner. Clerical Duties, 7.01 per cent; Classroom Duties, 6.62 per cent; Pupil Personnel, 15.59 per cent; Administration, 30.74 per cent; Supervision, 24.71 per cent; Community Relations, 9.49 per cent; and Miscellaneous Activities, 5.84 per cent. Class B and Class A principals allocated considerably more time for classroom duties than did the principals of other size groups.

III. PRESSURES ON THE PRINCIPAL

This section considered eleven kinds of individuals or groups which sometimes seek to bring about changes in the operation of the schools.

Question 26-A. Athletic Minded Individuals or Groups?

In response to the question, 38 principals, or 13 per cent,

indicated that considerable pressure was felt from athletic minded individuals or groups, 135, or 47 per cent, reported occasional pressure, and 116, or 40 per cent, reported little pressure.

Question 26-B: Extreme Right-Wing Individuals or Groups?

According to responses to the question, little pressure was exerted upon high school principals from extreme right-wing individuals or groups. Only 2 per cent stated that considerable pressure was felt; 12 per cent felt occasional pressure, and 86 per cent reported little or no pressure from this source.

Question 26-C: Extreme Left-Wing Individuals or Groups?

Principals indicated that little pressure was exerted by extreme left-wing individuals or groups. Less than 3 per cent considerable pressure, about 15 per cent felt occasional pressure, and about 83 per cent felt little or no pressure.

Question 26-D: Individuals or Groups Seeking to Censor Books?

Respondents to the question indicated that individuals or groups seeking to censor books were a minor problem in most high schools. No principal reported considerable pressure, 9 per cent felt occasional pressure, and 91 per cent reported little or no pressure.

Question 26-E: State Colleges and/or Universities?

Responses to the question indicated that high school principals did not view the influence of state colleges and universities with alarm. Less than 2 per cent reported considerable pressure;

about 19 per cent reported occasional pressure and about 79 per cent reported little or no pressure. AAA and AAAA principals reported more pressure from colleges and universities than did principals of smaller high schools.

Question 26-F. Religious or Church Groups?

More than three-fourths of the principals reported that little or no pressure was exerted by religious or church groups. Only 1 per cent reported considerable pressure, and only 22 per cent reported occasional pressure.

Question 26-G. Mass Media (Local Newspapers, Radio, Television)?

Less than 2 per cent of the principals reported considerable pressure from the mass media about 26 per cent reported occasional pressure, and 72 per cent reported little or no pressure. Responses indicated that larger schools experience more pressure from this source than the smaller schools.

Question 26-H. Local Citizens or Parent Groups?

More pressure was reported from local citizens or parent groups than from any other source. Principals from Class B and A schools indicated that they experienced greater pressures from this source than did the principals of the larger schools. From the total sample 7 per cent reported considerable pressure; 58 per cent reported occasional pressure; and 35 per cent reported little or no pressure.

Question 26-I P.T.A.?

Principals indicated that not as much pressure was exerted by the P.T.A. as from other local citizen or parent groups. Only

3 per cent reported considerable pressure; 28 per cent reported occasional pressure; and 69 per cent reported little or no pressure.

Question 26-J. Teacher Organizations?

Responses to this question indicated that principals of larger high schools felt considerably more pressure from teacher organizations than did principals of smaller schools. This was clearly indicated by the fact that each successively larger high school group reported a greater percentage of considerable or occasional pressure. Less than 2 per cent reported considerable pressure; 30 per cent reported occasional pressure; and 69 per cent reported little or no pressure.

Question 26-K Student Groups?

Principals of larger high schools reported a greater pressure from student groups than did principals of smaller high schools. Only 3 per cent of the principals reported considerable pressure 30 per cent reported occasional pressure; and 67 per cent reported little or no pressure from student groups.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE CERTIFICATION

This section questioned high school principals about their opinions regarding present certification requirements governing Texas secondary principals. Participants were given a choice of three possible answers for each question concerning requirements to obtain a Texas secondary principal's certificate.

Question 27-A: Requirement of Three Years Experience?

Few principals felt that the requirement of three years teaching experience should be relaxed. Less than 2 per cent felt that less experience as a teacher should be required; 34 per cent felt that more teaching experience should be required and 64 per cent felt that the present requirements regarding teaching experience were satisfactory.

Question 27-B: Professional Course Work?

Principals were not in real agreement about the need for more or less professional course work for certification. Almost 19 per cent felt the need for more professional courses before certification; less than 20 per cent felt that less professional course work should be required; and about 62 per cent felt that the present requirements for professional courses were satisfactory.

Question 27-C: 60-Hour Program?

Few principals felt that more than 60 semester hours above the bachelors degree should be required for professional administrative certification. Less than 3 per cent felt the need for additional hours; almost 50 per cent felt that certification should be based on less than 60 semester hours above the bachelors degree; and 48 per cent indicated that the present program was satisfactory.

V. PRINCIPAL'S ROLE IN ADMINISTRATION

This section asked four questions to determine the high school principal's overall role in the administration of the school.

Question 28: In Your School System, What Is Your Understanding of the Administrative Point of View of the Place of the High School Principal?

From the responses to the question, it seemed that the principals felt fairly highly regarded in their school system. Almost 47 per cent reported that they were publicly recognized as the head of the school with considerable authority to plan, to organize, and to administer the educational program of the school, 39 per cent indicated that the principal was viewed as the administrative head of the school, assigned primarily to carry out the policies of the central office; and 14 per cent indicated that the principal was neither authorized nor encouraged to proceed independently to alter the school's program in any significant manner. A higher percentage of Class B principals indicated that they have little administrative authority than did any of the other groups.

Question 29: What Is the Principal's Role in Developing Educational Policies for the School System as a Whole?

Responses to the question indicated that principals felt they had an important role in the development of policy for the school district. Less than 2 per cent reported that they were never consulted; 9 per cent reported that they were seldom consulted; about 15 per cent reported that they may be asked to comment upon policy developed by the central office, about 19 per cent reported that they may be asked to comment upon policy developed by the central office and get some encouragement to propose policies, and almost 56 per cent stated that they were encouraged to propose policies and to help develop them.

Question 30: What Is the Principal's Role in Selecting the Faculty of Your School?

Over 75 per cent of the principals reported that they were involved in the selection of faculty members for their buildings. About 25 per cent reported that all assignments were made by the central office with the principal having no voice in the selection of teachers. A greater percentage of Class B and A principals had little to do with the selection of faculty than did the principals of any other group.

Question 31: What Is Your Role in the Development of a Budget for Your School?

Principals indicated that their role in the budgetary process was somewhat limited. Responses from 43 per cent of the principals indicated no responsibilities; 37 per cent reported the general needs of the school and suggested improvements but budgetary decisions were made by the central office; 18 per cent prepared budget proposals and had an opportunity to defend and explain proposed expenditures; and almost 2 per cent indicated some other role in the budgetary process.

VI. TEACHER EVALUATION

This section considered the role of the principal in the process of teacher evaluation. Questions 32 and 33 sought to determine the principal's position in the process. Question 34 attempted to determine the principal's attitude toward teacher evaluation.

Question 32: Who Is Primarily Responsible for the Evaluation of Teaching Personnel in Your Building?

Over 88 per cent of the respondents stated that the principal was primarily responsible for the evaluation of teachers; less than 1 per cent reported that it was the primary responsibility of a supervisor; and 1 per cent stated that it was the responsibility of an evaluation committee. About 10 per cent indicated that evaluation of teaching personnel was the responsibility of someone other than the positions named on the questionnaire. Most of these indicated that the task was handled by the superintendent. Only five principals outside of Class B or A indicated that evaluation was handled by any one other than the principal.

Question 33: Does Your District Provide Evaluators With Written Procedures and Standards to Assist With the Task of Teacher Evaluation?

Only 30 per cent of the respondents indicated that their district furnished evaluators with written standards and procedures to assist with the task of teacher evaluation. This practice was in greater evidence among larger schools than among smaller ones.

Question 34-A: Standards and Procedures for Evaluation Should Be Developed Jointly by Administrators and Teachers?

Almost 90 per cent of the respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that the development of evaluation procedures should be a cooperative effort between teachers and administrators.

Question 34-B: Standards and Procedures for Evaluation Should be Published and Made Available to Teachers and Explained to Them?

Over 90 per cent agreed that teachers should receive a printed copy of the standards and procedures of evaluation. Less

than 5 per cent of the principals disagreed with the statement.

Question 34-C: Principals Should Give the Classroom Teacher Advance Notice About an Impending Classroom Observation?

Principals were not in agreement about the practice of giving teachers advance notice of a classroom observation. Slightly more than 53 per cent agreed that this should be done but 38 per cent diagreed. Responses indicated that principals of smaller schools were generally more favorable to the idea of advance notice of class visitation than were the principals of larger schools.

Question 34-D: Formal Observation Should Be Followed by a Conference Between the Teacher and the Principal?

Less than 4 per cent of the principals disagreed with the statement that a conference between the principal and the teacher should follow classroom observation; more than 89 per cent agreed that a conference should be held.

Question 34-E: There Should Always Be a Written Evaluation Report?

Although a majority of the principals agreed with the statement that there should always be a written evaluation report, there was considerable disagreement with the statement. Almost 62 per cent of the respondents agreed with the statement; about 26 per cent disagreed; and almost 13 per cent had no opinion. Little variation was noted in the responses of principals from different classifications.

Question 34-F: The Teacher Should Always Receive a Written Evaluation Report and Have an Opportunity to React to It?

Over 65 per cent of the principals agreed that the teacher should have an opportunity to react to a written evaluation report; over 26 per cent disagreed with the statement, and almost 19 per cent had no opinion. Percentages of responses from each of the five classification groups were very similar.

VIII. EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

This section considered nine methods of improving instruction which have been suggested by writers in the field. Principals were asked to rank the five items which they felt were the most effective in improving instruction. Items ranked number 1 were assigned a value of five; items ranked number 2 were assigned a value of four; items ranked number 3 were assigned a value of three; items ranked number 4 were assigned a value of two, and items ranked number 5 were assigned a value of one. The values of responses were cumulated to determine a rank order listing of the nine methods of improving instruction.

Question 35: From the Nine Methods of Improving Instruction Listed, Rank the Five Items Which You Feel to Be Most Effective?

From the nine methods of improving instruction listed, principals considered the most effective to be providing classroom teachers with instructional materials and by maintaining a high degree of morale and sharing among the entire staff; helping individual teachers identify, study, and take action on problems in their own class was ranked second; organizing committees of teachers to study and report on instructional programs was ranked third; visiting classes and observing teachers and children at

work was ranked fourth; and keeping abreast of research and school developments and seeking to interpret those to the staff was ranked fifth. There was little variation in the ranking of the nine methods for improving instruction from any of the five groups.

IX. PROFESSIONAL NEGOTIATIONS

This section considered the high school principal's attitudes toward professional negotiations. Question 36 asked whether the school district had a professional negotiations agreement with the certified personnel. Question 37 sought to determine the principal's own preference for his position in such an agreement. Question 38 considered six statements regarding professional negotiations and the principal's attitudes toward them.

Question 36: Does Your District Have a Formal Professional Negotiations Agreement with the Certified Personnel?

More than 55 per cent of the principals were in agreement with the statement; about 17 per cent disagreed; and more then 17 per cent had no opinion. The major difference in the responses to the question was that fewer principals of Class AAAA schools indicated that they had no opinion about the statement.

Question 38-B: Professional Negotiations Tend to Create Friction Between the Principal and the Faculty?

Almost 38 per cent of the sample indicated that professional negotiations do tend to create friction between the principal and the faculty; almost 32 per cent disagreed with the statement; and over 30 per cent had no opinion. Responses varied little among the five classifications of principals in the sample.

Question 38-C: Professional Negotiations Is a Major Step Toward Upgrading the Teaching Profession?

No agreement about professional negotiations being a major step toward upgrading the educational profession was evident from responses to the question. About 30 per cent of the respondents had formed no opinion about the issue; 37 per cent agreed that it is a major step; and 32 per cent disagreed.

Question 38-D: A Professional Negotiations Agreement Tends to Enhance the Principal's Role of Providing Leadership?

More principals disagreed with the statement than agreed with it. Only 28 per cent agreed that the principal's role of educational leadership is enhanced through a professional negotiations agreement; 35 per cent disagreed; and over 37 per cent had formed no opinion.

Question 38-E: A Professional Negotiations Agreement Tends to Provide for Better Understanding and Educational Improvement?

Almost 41 per cent of the principals agreed that a professional negotiations agreement does provide for better understanding and educational improvement; almost 37 per cent disagreed with the statement; and 33 per cent of the respondents had formed no opinion. Little variation was seen among the responses of any of the five classifications of principals in the study.

Question 38-F: Professional Negotiations Tend to Diminish Statewide Legislation?

Only 19 per cent of the principals agreed that professional negotiations tend to diminish the effect of statewide legislation; 37 per cent disagreed with the statement; and 44 per cent had no opinion.

X. STUDENT ACTIVISM AND STUDENT UNREST

Question 39-A: Student Unrest and Activism Is Becoming a Major Problem in the High School of Today?

Over 71 per cent of all respondents to the question agreed that student unrest was becoming a major problem on the high school campus; more than 20 per cent disagreed with the statement; and 8 per cent of the respondents had formed no opinion. A striking difference in responses from the five classifications of principals was that principals of the larger schools were much more emphatic in agreeing that student unrest was a major problem than were principals of smaller schools.

Question 39-B: Many of the Protests of Today's High School Students Are Justified?

Only two principals strongly agreed with the statement that many of the protests of high school students were justified. A total of only 24 per cent agreed with the statement; 63 per cent disagreed; and almost 13 per cent had no opinion. Percentages varied little among the five groups of principals in the survey.

Question 39-C: School Personnel Have Failed to Recognize or Attempt to Understand Many Legitimate Complaints from Students?

A majority of the principals responding to the question disagreed with the statement that school personnel had failed to recognize or understand many legitimate student complaints. Almost 39 per cent agreed with the statement; 55 per cent disagreed; and 9 per cent had formed no opinion.

Question 39-D: Students Should Be Allowed to Dress as They Please and Wear Hair Styles of Their Choice as Long as Instruction Is Not Seriously Impeded?

A large majority of principals disagreed with the statement that students should be allowed to dress as they please and wear hair styles of their choice. Almost 83 per cent of the respondents disagreed with the statement; less than 13 per cent agreed; and only 5 per cent indicated that they had formed no opinion. There were no marked differences in the responses from the five different classifications of principals.

Question 39-E: Students as Well as Faculty Should be Involved in the Planning of and Have Responsibility for Conducting Student Activities?

Over 93 per cent of the principals agreed that students should be involved in planning student activities; less than 7 per cent disagreed; and about 5 per cent had no opinion about the statement.

Question 39-F: Students Should Have a Right to Some Type of Machinery to Appeal Administrative Decisions Which They Feel Deprive Them of Their Rights as Citizens?

Over half of the principals, 59 per cent, agreed that students should have some type of machinery to appeal administrative decisions which they feel deprive them of their rights; 28 per cent disagreed; and almost 13 per cent had no opinion. Principals of smaller schools did not agree with the statement to the extent of principals of larger schools.

Question 39-G: Students Need a Time and a Place to Voice Their Own Opinions and to Let Adults Know What Their Problems Are?

A large majority of the principals responding to the survey agreed that students should have a time and a place to voice their own opinions. Almost 84 per cent agreed with the statement;

11 per cent disagreed; and 5 per cent had no opinion.

Question 39-H: To Be Most Effective a Student Planning Council Should Be Restricted to Only Those Students of Average or Above-Average Academic Standing?

Slightly more than 30 per cent of the principals indicated that they agreed with the statement; over 60 per cent disagreed; and 9 per cent had formed no opinion.

Question 39-I: A School District Should Establish Guidelines to Deal with Disruptive Student Activities?

Principals strongly felt that school districts should establish guidelines for handling disruptive student activities. Over 92 per cent of the principals agreed; less than 5 per cent disagreed; and about 3 per cent indicated that they had no opinion. Little difference was noted in responses by classifications of principals except as to the degree with which they agreed with the statement. Principals of each successively larger classification of schools showed a higher percentage of respondents who strongly agreed with the statement.

XI. FEDERAL ACTIVITIES IN EDUCATION

This section condidered eight statements relative to the activities of the federal government in public school education.

Question 40-A: The Increased Federal Monies for Public School Education Have Greatly Improved the Quality of Education for High School Students?

A majority of principals agreed that federal monies have

greatly improved the quality of education for high school students. Almost 60 per cent of the principals agreed with the statement; 25 per cent disagreed; and 15 per cent had no opinion. A smaller percentage of AAA principals agreed than did the sample as a whole.

Question 40-B: Federal Monies for Education Have Spurred Local Districts to Greater Creativity in Developing Educational Programs?

Over 60 per cent of the principals agreed that local districts have been spurred to greater creativity through the use of federal funds. Almost 24 per cent disagreed with the statement; and 14 per cent had no opinion. Little variation was noted in the response from principals of the different size classifications.

Question 40-C: Extra Administrative Efforts and Problems With Federal Programs Outweigh the Benefits Received?

A small majority of the principals disagreed that benefits from federal programs were outweighed by extra administrative efforts and problems. Almost 51 per cent of the respondents disagreed with the statement; 27 per cent agreed; and 22 per cent had formed no opinion.

Question 40-D: Guidelines for Federally Funded Programs Are Too Restrictive to Allow Enough Local Initiative in Program Development?

A slight majority of principals agreed with the statement that guidelines for federally funded programs are too restrictive to allow adequate local initiative in developing the program. Slightly more than 51 per cent agreed with the statement; 29 per cent disagreed; and 20 per cent had no opinion. Class AAA principals agreed with the statement to a greater extent than did the principals of any other classification.

Question 40-E: The Uncertainty of Federal Funds from Year to Year Make it Difficult for Schools to Plan Long Range Programs?

A large majority of the principals, over 85 per cent, agreed that long range planning of federally funded programs was made difficult by the uncertainty of funds. Only 6 per cent disagreed and 8 per cent had formed no opinion.

Question 40-F: General Aid from the Federal Government for Educational Purposes Would Be Preferable to Special Purpose Aid?

Over 68 per cent of the high school principals responding to the questionnaire indicated that general federal aid for education would be preferable to categorical or special purpose aid; 11 per cent disagreed; and 21 per cent had no opinion. A greater percentage of AAAA principals agreed with the statement than did the principals of any other classification.

Question 40--C: Increased Federal Aid for Education Will Result in Additional Loss of Local Control to the State Government?

A slight majority of principals agreed that additional federal aid for education would bring additional loss of local control to the state government. About 54 per cent agreed with the statement; over 29 per cent disagreed; and 17 per cent had formed no opinion.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. SUMMARY

The literature reviewed seemed to indicate that the high school principal is one of the most influential persons in determining the quality of instructional programs in the public school system. The literature also indicated that the high school principalship is undergoing rapid change. Professional educators advocate that the high school principal exert a greater effort toward becoming an instructional leader of the educational program at the building level.

It was the purpose of this study to draw a comprehensive, reliable, and up-to-date profile of the Texas senior high school principalship and to determine the Texas high school principals' views on current educational issues. The study was limited to the thirty-five per cent of the Texas high school principals from each of the five University Interscholastic League classifications of schools who were selected at random for participation in the study.

The results obtained from the survey were treated collectively and the data were tabulated in table form.

II. CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the data presented in this study, the following conclusions seemed to be justified:

1. The size of the Texas high school is directly related to its proximity to an urban area. Few large high schools were found in predominantly rural or agricultural areas; few small high schools were found in predominantly urban areas.

2. The Texas high school principal is relatively new in his position. Less than half of the principals have served as high school principal for more than five years. Less than one-third of the principals have served as principal more than five years in their present district.

3. The high school principal has remained fairly stable in his position. More than two-thirds of the high school principals in Texas have held only one high school principalship.

4. In Texas, the high school principalship is predominantly an occupation of married males with a stable family life. Almost 99 per cent of the principals are men; almost 98 per cent of the principals are presently married; and almost 92 per cent of the principals have one or more children. These responses indicated that Texas superintendents and boards of education prefer a married man with a stable family life as a high school principal.

5. The mean age of the Texas high school principal is 43.70 years. Responses to the survey indicated that principals of smaller schools were likely to be younger than principals of larger schools.

6. The Texas high school principal has attained a relatively high educational level. More than 93 per cent of the principals have

earned at least a masters degree. Over 55 per cent have earned at least 15 semester hours above the masters degree. Principals of larger schools have attained a higher level of education than have principals of smaller schools.

7. The two major institutions providing graduate level education for the Texas high school principal are East Texas State University and North Texas State University. These two institutions have granted the last degree to more than one-fourth of the high school principals in the state.

8. Most of the Texas high school principals have received graduate training specifically designed for the high school principalship. Almost 50 per cent earned their masters degree in educational administration; over 37 per cent earned the masters degree in secondary education.

9. Principals teach classes on a regular basis in only the smaller schools.

10. The median of years employed in a professional educational position for the Texas high school principal is 16.93 years. The median of years employed as a teacher before the first administrative position is 6.58. Principals of smaller schools have been employed in education for a shorter period of time than have principals of larger schools and they served as teachers for a shorter period of time before their first administrative position.

11. Before entering administration more principals served as coaches than in any other educational position. In the smaller schools most principals moved into the principalship directly from coaching or classroom teaching. In the larger schools most principals first served

as a coach or as a classroom teacher then moved into a junior high school principalship, an elementary school principalship, or an assistant principalship before becoming a high school principal.

12. Most principals hold membership in more than one professional organization. All principals were members of the Texas State Teachers Association. A greater per centage of principals of larger schools were members of the state and national principal's associations than were principals of the smaller schools.

13. The median work week for the Texas high school principal is about 47 hours. There is little variation in the length of the principal's work week as a result of the size of the school.

14. There is a very wide range of salaries for high school principals in the five University Interscholastic League classifications of schools. Principals of larger schools receive a much higher salary than principals of smaller schools.

15. Almost half of the Texas high school principals indicated that they do not expect to remain in the high school principalship. A smaller percentage of principals of larger high schools indicated that they planned to move to some other position than did the principals of smaller schools. Of those principals who indicated that they plan to leave the high school principalship, half planned to seek a superintendency.

16. Principals of the Texas high schools felt that more than fifty per cent of their time should be allocated to administrative and supervisory functions.

17. The Texas high school principal perceives few real pressures from outside groups on the performance of his duties. Principals consider

the greatest pressure to be exerted from local citizen or parent groups, followed by athletic-minded individuals or groups.

18. As a whole, principals are fairly satisfied with present certification requirements. Almost half of the principals, however, feel that the present requirement of 60 semester hours above the bachelors degree is too great.

19. Principals indicated that they have an important role in the administration of their school. They function in developing district-wide educational policy, in selecting faculty for their school, and to a limited extent in developing a budget for their school.

20. A large majority of high school principals are responsible for the evaluation of teaching personnel in their building. In only Class B schools were there a large number of personnel other than the principal primarily responsible for evaluating personnel.

21. Approximately one-third of the school districts provide evaluators with written procedures and standards to assist with the task of teacher evaluation. A greater percentage of large districts provide these evaluation standards than do small districts.

22. A large majority of high school principals feel that teachers and administrators should jointly develop evaluation procedures and that teachers should receive a printed copy of these standards.

23. Texas high school principals feel that the most effective methods of improving instruction are to provide classroom teachers with many instructional materials and to help individual teachers identify, study, and take action on problems in their own classes.

24. Few schools have a formal professional negotiations agreement with certified personnel. A much greater percentage of larger schools

have such an agreement than do smaller schools. From the large number of 'no opinion' responses to questions about professional negotiations, it appears that Texas high school principals have not given considerable attention to the problem of professioanl negotiations in the public schools.

25. A majority of the high school principals agree that student unrest and activism is becoming a major concern in the Texas high schools. A majority of the principals feel that most of the protests of high school students are unjustified.

26. Principals definitely feel that a school district should establish guidelines for a principal to follow in meeting disruptive student activities.

27. A majority of principals feel that federal monies for education have greatly improved the quality of education for Texas high school students.

28. A large majority of Texas high school principals feel that long range planning of educational programs is greatly hampered by the year-to-year uncertainty of federal funds.

29. A small majority of principals feel that the increased use of federal funds for educational purposes will result in the further loss of local control of the public school system.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Superintendents and boards of education should recognize the importance of the high school principalship and grant the principal adequate authority to be a positive force for improving the educational program of the local high school. It is recommended that principals be

given a greater voice in the selection and placement of teaching personnel in their building. It is recommended that principals have a larger voice in the development of an educational budget for their building.

2. It is strongly recommended that teachers be involved in the development of procedures and standards for the evaluation of professional personnel. It is further recommended that all school districts provide evaluators with a set of written evaluators and that these standards be made available to all teachers.

3. It is recommended that Texas high school principals give more consideration to the possible effects of student unrest and activism in their schools and take positive steps to prevent disruptive activities on the campus. It is recommended that school districts establish district-wide guidelines for handling disruptive student activities. Principals, faculty, and students should be involved in the preparation of these guidelines.

4. It is recommended that principals should be a part of the administrative bargaining team and should be actively involved in the development of any professional negotiations agreement which is made with the certified personnel.

5. Since 85 per cent of Texas high school principals felt that long range planning of federally funded educational programs is greatly hampered by the uncertainty of funding, it is recommended that funds for programs be appropriated early enough that districts can adequately plan and can gain maximum benefits.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Congreve, Willard J. "The Role of the Principal in School Improvement," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XLVII (March, 1964), 3-9.

Elam, Stanley M., Myron Lieberman, and Michael H. Moscow, (eds.), Readings on Collective Negotiations in Public Education. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1967.

Gibb, Jack R. "The Expanding Role of the Administrator," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LI (May, 1967), 46-60.

Jones, James J., C. Jackson Salisbury, and Ralph L. Spencer. Secondary School Administration. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969.

McGowan, William N. "Changing Role of the Secondary School Principal," Journal of Secondary Education, XLII (October, 1967), 280-285.

McIntyre, Kenneth E. Selection of Educational Administrators: A UCEA Position Paper. Columbus, Ohio: The University Council for Educational Administration, 1966.

Redfern, George B. How to Appraise Teaching. Columbus, Ohio: School Management Institute, 1963.

Saylor, J. Galen. "Captive to Funded Projects," Educational Leadership, XXVI (January, 1969), 328-334.

Shelton, Landon. "Supervision of Teachers: The Administrator's First Responsibility," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XLIX (October, 1965), 26-31.

Onoforio, John E. "The Public School Principal in Terms of Today's Leadership Expectations," West Haven, Connecticutt, September 17, 1968. (ERIC).

Wing, Lucy. Staff Development Practices and Potentials," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LII (January, 1968), 11-23.

THE TEXAS HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL: CHARACTERISTICS AND

VIEWS ON SELECTED EDUCATIONAL ISSUES

DIRECTIONS: Most of the questionnaire items can be answered by checking the appropriate blank. Other items require supplying additional information. Please check the one response which most nearly reflects your view on each question. Please answer all questions.

School:_____

Classification: B_____ A_____ AA_____ AAA_____ AAAA_____

Do you wish to receive a summary of the results? Yes_____ No_____

General Information

1. How would you classify your school's scholastic population? (a)_____largely rural and agricultural; (b) ____about evenly divided between rural and urban; (c)_____mostly urban (d)_____other_____

2. How long have you been a high school principal? (Include this year.)_____

3. How long have you been a high school principal in this district?_____

4. Including your present position, How many different high school principalships have you held?_____

Personal and Professional

5. Your sex: Male_____ Female_____

6. Your age: _____

7. Marital status: Single_____ Married_____ Widowed_____ Divorced_____

8. Number of children:_____

9. Check the category which best describes your degree status: (a)_____No degree; (b)_____Bachelor's degree; (c)_____Master's degree; (d)_____Master's degree plus 15-29 hours; (e)_____Master's degree plus 30-59 hours; (f)_____Master's degree plus 60 or more hours; (g)_____Earned doctorate degree.

10. In what year was your last degree earned?_____

11. What college or university granted your last degree?_____

12. In what area did you major on the undergraduate level?_____

13. On the master's level, what was your major?_____

14. On the doctoral level, what was your major?_____

15. How many classes do you regularly teach?_____

16. How many years have you been employed in a professional educational position? (Include this year.)_____

17. How many years were you a teacher before your first administrative position?_____

18. What school position did you hold immediately before first becoming a high school principal?_____

19. Before going into administration, what was your basic teaching experience? (The position you held longest as a primary assignment.)_____

20. Check the professional educational organization(s) in which you hold membership. (a)_____TSTA; (b)_____NEA; (c)_____TASSP; (d)_____NASSP; (e)_____ASCD; (f)_____TASCD; (g)_____Phi Delta Kappa; (h)_____Kappa Delta Pi; (i)Other_____

21. Including the lunch hour, how many hours do you usually devote to your position daily? (a)_____6 hours or less; (b)_____7 hours; (c)_____8 hours; (d)_____9 hours; (e)_____10 hours; (f)_____11 hours or more.

22. How many hours do you usually spend at school on Saturdays?_____

23. What is your annual salary? (a)_____under $8,000; (b)_____8,000-9,500; (c)_____9,501-11,000; (d)_____11,001-12,500; (e)_____12,501-14,000; (f)_____14,001-15,500; (g)_____15,501-17,000; (h)_____17,001 or more.

24. Do you plan to eventually move to a position other than the high school principalship? Yes_____ No_____ Uncertain_____. IF YES, (a)_____to an elementary principalship; (b) _____to a junior high principalship; (c)_____to return to teaching; (d)_____to a superintendency; (e)_____to a junior college position; (f)_____to a position in a four-year college or university; (g)_____to some other educational position; (h)_____to leave the educational profession.

25. If conditions were ideal, how do you think your time might be distributed so as to perform the work of the principal most effectively?

A. Clerical duties_____%
B. Classroom duties_____%
C. Pupil Personnel_____%
D. Administration_____%
E. Supervision_____%
F. Community relations_____%
G. Miscellaneous_____%

ressures on the Principal

26. Below are listed several kinds of individuals or groups which may have sought to bring about certain changes in the operation of the schools. Indicate the strength or the extent of influence of each interest in your school.

A Considerable pressure B Occasional pressure C Little or no pressure	A	B	C
A. Athletic minded individuals or groups	[]	[]	[]
B. Extreme right-wing individuals or groups	[]	[]	[]
C. Extreme left-wing individuals or groups	[]	[]	[]
D. Individuals or groups seeking to censor books	[]	[]	[]
E. State colleges and/or universities	[]	[]	[]
F. Religious or church groups	[]	[]	[]
G. Mass Media (Local newspapers, radio, television)	[]	[]	[]
H. Local citizens or parent groups	[]	[]	[]
I. P. T. A.	[]	[]	[]
J. Teacher organizations	[]	[]	[]
K. Student groups	[]	[]	[]

Administrative Certification

27. What is your opinion of the certification requirements governing Texas secondary school principals with respect to:

A. Requirement of three years experience: (a)_____Certification should require more teaching experience; (b)_____Certification should require less teaching experience; (c)_____Present requirements for teaching experience are satisfactory.

B. Professional course work: (a)_____More professional course work should be required; (b)_____less professional course work should be required; (c)_____Present requirements are satisfactory.

C. 60-hour program: (a)_____More than 60 semester hours above the bachelor's degree should be required for professional administrative certification; (b)_____Less than 60 semester hours should be required; (c)_____60-hour program is satisfactory.

Principal's Role in Administration

28. In your school system what is your understanding of the administrative point of view of the place of the high school principal?
(a)_____The principal is publicly recognized as the head of his school with considerable authority to plan, organize, and administer the educational program of his school. (b)_____ The principal is viewed as the administrative head of the school, assigned primarily to carry out the policies of the central office. He is given some encouragement to plan for his school community. (c)_____The principal is neither encouraged nor authorized to proceed independently to alter his school's program in any significant manner.

29. What is the principal's role in developing educational policies for the school system as a whole? (a)_____Never consulted; (b)_____Seldom consulted; (c)_____May be asked to comment upon policies developed by the central office; (d)_____May be asked to comment upon policies developed by the central office and get some encouragement to propose policies; (e)_____Encouraged to propose policies and to help develop them.

30. What is the principal's role in selecting the faculty of your school? (a)_____All assignments are made by the central office with the principal having no voice in the selection of teachers. (b)_____The principal has the right to ask for the type person needed and to accept or reject from among several offered by the central office. (c)_____The principal outlines the qualifications of each teacher needed, examines the personnel records, interviews applicants, and recommends the applicants for employment. (e)_____Other_____.

31. What is your role in the development of a budget for your school? (a)_____None; it is done by the central office; (b)_____Report the general needs of the school and suggest improvements but budgetary decisions are made by the central office; (c)_____The principal and his staff prepare budget proposals and have an opportunity to defend and explain proposed expenditures; (d)_____Other_____.

Teacher Evaluation

32. Who is primarily responsible for the evaluation of teaching personnel in your building? (a)_____Principal; (b)_____Assistant principal; (c)_____Supervisor; (d)_____Evaluation Committee: (e)_____Other_____.

33. Does your district provide evaluators with written procedures and standards to assist with the task of teacher evaluation? Yes_____ No_____

34. Check the box which most nearly represents your feeling about the following statements. A Strongly agree B Agree C No opinion D Disagree E Strongly disagree.

	A	B	C	D	E
A. Standards and procedures for evaluation should be developed jointly by administrators and teachers.	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
B. Standards and procedures for evaluation should be published and made available to teachers and explained to them.	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
C. Principals should give the teacher advance notice about an impending classroom observation.	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
D. Formal observation should be followed by a conference between the teacher and the principal.	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
E. There should always be a written evaluation report.	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
F. The teacher should always receive a written evaluation report and have an opportunity to react to it.	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]

Educational Leadership

35. Below are nine methods of improving instruction suggested by writers in the field. Rank the five items which you feel to be most effective.

A._____By organizing committees of teachers to study and report on instructional programs.
B._____By leading the discussion at faculty meetings.
C._____By helping individual teachers identify, study, and take action on problems in their own classes.
D._____By the principal's own careful study of individual children and by making the findings available to teachers.
E._____By visiting classes and observing teachers and children at work.
F._____By giving lectures to the staff on methods of teaching and related topics.
G._____By providing classroom teachers with many instructional materials and by maintaining a high degree of morale and sharing among the entire staff.
H._____By continuous studies of the factors which impair instruction and reporting findings to teachers.
I._____By keeping abreast of research and school developments and seeking to interprest these to the staff.

Professional Negotiations

36. Does your school district have a formal professional negotiations agreement with the certified personnel? Yes_____ No_____

37. What do you feel to be the proper position of the principal in a professional negotiations agreement? (a)_____Align with the central office and board as management; (b)_____Function as part of the teacher bargaining unit; (c)_____Establish own bargaining unit composed only of principals; (d)_____Other_____.

38. Please check the box which most nearly represents your feeling about the following statements on professional negotiations. (Whether or not your district has a formal agreement.) A Strongly Agree B Agree C No Opinion D Disagree E Strongly Disagree

	A	B	C	D	E
A. A professional negotiations agreement provides a reasonable voice for employees in policy making.	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]

		A	B	C	D	E
B.	Professional negotiations tend to create friction between the principal and the faculty.	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
C.	Professional negotiations is a major step toward upgrading the teaching profession.	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
D.	A professional negotiations agreement tends to enhance the principal's role of providing educational leadership.	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
E.	A professional negotiations agreement tends to provide for better understanding and educational improvement.	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
F.	Professional negotiations tend to diminish statewide legislation.	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]

Student Activism and Student Unrest

39. Please check the box which most nearly represents your opinion about the following statements on student activism and unrest. A Strongly Agree B Agree C No Opinion D Disagree E Strongly Disagree

		A	B	C	D	E
A.	Student unrest and activism is becoming a major problem in the high school of today.	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
B.	Many of the protests of today's high school students are justified.	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
C.	School personnel have failed to recognize or attempt to understand many legitimate complaints from students.	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
D.	Students should be allowed to dress as they please and wear hair styles of their choice as long as instruction is not seriously impeded.	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
E.	Students as well as faculty should be involved in the planning of and have responsibility of conducting student activities.	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
F.	Students should have a right to some type of machinery to appeal administrative decisions which they feel deprive them of their rights as citizens.	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
G.	Students need a time and a place to voice their own opinions and to let adults know what their problems are.	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
H.	To be most effective a student-planning council should be restricted to only those students of average or above-average academic standing.	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
I.	A school district should establish definite guidelines to deal with disruptive student activities.	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]

Federal Activities in Education

40. Please check the box which most nearly represents your opinion about the following statements regarding federal activities in public school education. A Strongly Agree B Agree C No Opinion D Disagree E Strongly Disagree

		A	B	C	D	E
A.	The increased federal monies for public school education have greatly improved the quality of education for high school students.	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
B.	Federal monies for education have spurred local districts to greater creativity in developing educational programs.	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
C.	Extra administrative efforts and problems with federal programs outweigh the benefits received.	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
D.	Guidelines for federally funded programs are too restrictive to allow enough local initiative in program development.	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
E.	The uncertainty of federal funds from year to year make it difficult for schools to plan long range programs.	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
F.	General aid from the federal government for educational purposes would be preferable to special purpose aid.	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
G.	Increased federal aid for education will result in additional loss of local control to the federal government.	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
H.	Increased federal aid for education will result in additional loss of local control to the state government.	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]